

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 93 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #71
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 22 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 71

Today's Topics:

 Koresh need ham flasher
 No Radios on Airlines
 Reduction of the code requirements (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 1993 01:06:24 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Koresh need ham flasher
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar14.165508.25078@netcom.com>, pdh@netcom.com (P D H) writes:
|> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:
|>
|> >There is a place for Morse. That is in Waco, Texas were the nasty ATF
|> >enforcers are blocking Koresh's telephone lines and they may be jamming
|> >his radio transmissions too. If someone in the Branch Davidans
|> >compound in Waco Texas could send Morse by flashing room lights on or
|> >off they could communicate with the press.

Our newsfeed is behind so I don't know if anyone else has followed up
on this yet by pointing out that it has already happened! I saw an AP
wire story a few days ago that said somebody in the compound sent a
message in Morse Code by blinking light to the press. I didn't keep a
copy of the story, but the message was something like "SOS SOS [...]
FBI broke off negotiations, we want the press".

I'm not kidding. Anybody heard any further reports?

Phil

Date: Sun, 21 Mar 1993 13:38:18 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!bogus.sura.net!darwin.sura.net!
news.Vanderbilt.Edu!news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No Radios on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>
> Actually, the newer airtransports need no help from anything outside the
> plane. I got to play around with a UPS 757 for a while one day. The inertial
> navigation system in that thing is quite neat to play with and accurate.
> It needs no input from GPS, LORAN, VOR or anything else.

>
Actually, a modern FMC type aircraft has triple IRUs, Inertial Reference Units, which are rated at 2 nm/hr, and actually deliver about one tenth that drift rate. The system however is CONSTANTLY update from outside sources, when available, usually the DME, distance measuring equipment, from 2 constantly changing pairs of stations. Radial/DME is not as accurate beyond about 40 miles. Alternatively, GPS can be used, and is being used by some carriers.

That drift rate without outside update is fine for oceanic operations, where the tolerances are 60 or 30 miles between aircraft, but for approaches, the result is a smoking hole in the ground.

Another problem is that modern aircraft are so data dependent that problems can occur due to interference with other than the actual navigation receivers. In fact, the Air Transport Association has such a thick file of documented problems that they are recommending stopping the use of any equipment on airliners.

Alan
WA4SCA
Captain, American Airlines

Date: Sun, 21 Mar 1993 21:54:35 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C42z8u.3v1@news.ysu.edu> ae674@yfn.ysu.edu (Reid Savage) writes:

>
>> Actually, all that is necessary is for the pilot to be a ham. The person on
>> the ground only needs to find a willing Amateur operator to make the
>> contact using "third-party" rules.
>My uncle is unfortunately not a ham. The radio he uses is a all band transceiver.
>Why does the fcc require seperate transceivers? There could conceivably
>be be a member of his crew with a amateur license so he could operate
>3rd party. Does anybody talk to airplane pilot hams? Most transatlantic
>pilots have a lot of time on there hands. The plane he flies is one of
>those newer airbus planes. They are so computerized that they pretty
>much fly them selves. I guess this is just another dumb fcc regulation.

The FCC would NOT require seperate transceivers! You can take ANY xcvr
and xmit on the ham bands PROVIDED you are licensed. It might be the
airline company that prohibits their radios from being fired up outside
the aeronautical freqs.

Just my \$0.02 worth.

Jeffrey, NH6IL.

Date: Sun, 21 Mar 1993 21:43:38 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C3x51I.1G1@news.ysu.edu> ae674@yfn.ysu.edu (Reid Savage) writes:
>
>Are there still code requirements for marine and aviation HF
>radio telephone licenses? If the answer is no what does one to
>get such licenses?

Reid (and anyone else that's interested):
RADIOTELEPHONE, FIRST CLASS: Elements 1,2,3,4; no code
RADIOTELEPHONE, SECOND CLASS: Elements 1,2,3; no code
RADIOTELEPHONE, THIRD CLASS: Elements 1,2; no code

Note that RT 3rd class is an operating permit; holders are not allowed to
make any adjustments that might result in improper transmitter operation
unless these are made under the direct supervision of a licensed operator
(i.e., a 1st or 2nd class holder).

If you're just a pleasure boater and want to operate on the marine freqs.
for safety reasons, there is the lowest grade permit, the

RESTRICTED RADIOTELEPHONE OPERATOR PERMIT: no test; requires that the

applicant certify that they can transmit and receive in English, that they are familiar with the rules and regs, and can keep a log.

I know nothing about the aviation HF RT license.

Jeffrey Herman, NH6IL, University of Hawaii, Department of Mathematics.
jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: 22 Mar 93 04:18:19 GMT
From: nevada.edu!jimil!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C49Doq.M6z@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <C3x51I.1G1@news.ysu.edu> ae674@yfn.ysu.edu (Reid Savage) writes:
>>

>>Are there still code requirements for marine and aviation HF
>>radio telephone licenses? If the answer is no what does one to
>>get such licenses?

>
>Reid (and anyone else that's interested):
>RADIOTELEPHONE, FIRST CLASS: Elements 1,2,3,4; no code
>RADIOTELEPHONE, SECOND CLASS: Elements 1,2,3; no code
>RADIOTELEPHONE, THIRD CLASS: Elements 1,2; no code
>

>Jeffrey Herman, NH6IL, University of Hawaii, Department of Mathematics.
>jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
>

Hi All,

I thought the Radiotelephone General Class replaced the above.

When I got mine a few years ago, there wasn't anymore 1st, 2nd. Not sure if there was still a 3rd or not.

They also changed the renewal. At that time they were good for life.

Can't remember the exact date, but must have been about 1981 or 82.

Just my 2 cents worth!!

73s & cul, "Ron", -=KU7Y=-

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 1993 03:27:31 GMT
From: gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Reduction of the code requirements
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C49Doq.M6z@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <C3x51I.1G1@news.ysu.edu> ae674@yfn.ysu.edu (Reid Savage) writes:

>>

>>Are there still code requirements for marine and aviation HF

>>radio telephone licenses? If the answer is no what does one to

>>get such licenses?

>

>Reid (and anyone else that's interested):

>RADIOTELEPHONE, FIRST CLASS: Elements 1,2,3,4; no code

>RADIOTELEPHONE, SECOND CLASS: Elements 1,2,3; no code

>RADIOTELEPHONE, THIRD CLASS: Elements 1,2; no code

The First and Second class licenses no longer exist. They were replaced by the General Radiotelephone license.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 22 Mar 1993 01:01:04 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <10aa5bINNgnq@topaz.bds.com>, <1993Mar19.023008.15269@qualcomm.com>, <1993Mar20.154128.17484@ke4zv.uucp>
Reply-To : karn@servo.qualcomm.com
Subject : Re: No Radios on Airlines

In article <1993Mar20.154128.17484@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

|> They only buy what the FAA *mandates* they buy. Any use of an unapproved
|> system would open them up to incredible legal liability suits if there
|> were an accident.

Agreed. And since GPS is not yet approved, it's understandable that it's not being used. But isn't LORAN-C now approved for enroute navigation? The FAA just spent quite a bit of money filling in the "mid continent gap" inherited from LORAN's marine and Coast Guard roots. Now that there's full CONUS LORAN-C coverage, why isn't it more widely used by commercial US aviation, at least as a backup to VOR/DME? Although the 100 Khz band is more susceptible to thunderstorms than VHF, the pulsed LORAN signal format is inherently very resistant to interference. (It almost qualifies as "spread spectrum").

On the other hand, the VOR and ILS signals are about as fragile as you can get. It's amazing they work as well as they do.

Phil

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #71
